



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—THE USE OF *ENIM* IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

In the winter of 1885–86, Goetz, who was busy with his new edition of the *Bacchides*, suggested to me, then a student at Jena, the investigation of the use of *enim* in the earlier language. The following pages present the results of that study, delayed and postponed for various causes these eleven years. While the conclusions may not be all that were hoped at the time the investigation was begun, from over twenty readings and comparisons of the entire text of Plautus and Terence, it is felt that the classification is more thorough and systematic than has been previously attempted. While my views on minor points have sometimes changed, my opinions and convictions on the most important usages have been strengthened by successive comparisons of the text. Of the numerous conjectures that would introduce *enim* into the text, only the more plausible have been noticed. It has not been deemed advisable to cumber the page with improbable emendations. Only disputed or typical passages have been quoted in full.

Nearly thirty years ago, Ramsay, in his edition of the *Mostellaria*,<sup>1</sup> stated: "we maintain that in the earlier writers *enimvero* always signifies 'for in truth' as *enim* always signifies 'for,' and that both are uniformly employed to introduce an explanation." Eleven years later Langen,<sup>2</sup> who devoted considerable space to the discussion and gave the most complete classification hitherto attempted, asserted with equal positiveness (p. 262): "Ich glaube behaupten zu dürfen *enim* ist bei Plautus *ausschliesslich* Bethauptungspartikel, es wird von ihm überhaupt nicht zur Begründung eines vorhergehenden Gedankens gebraucht." This latter view became at once the prevalent one among Plautine students, although a number of prominent editors and critics have taken more or less exception to its sweeping conclusions. There is, it would seem, a position between these two extremes, which we are warranted in taking.

<sup>1</sup> London, 1869, p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus*. Leipzig, 1880, pp. 261–71.

I.—*The Position of Enim.*

The position of *enim* may best be considered under two heads : (1) the position of *enim* in the sentence ; (2) the position of *enim* in relation to other words.

(i) *The position of enim in the sentence.*—In Plautus *enim* stands as the first word in the sentence in the following passages : Aul. 500,<sup>1</sup> Capt. 592, Cas. 890, Cist. 777, Mil. 429, 1018, Most. 1144, Pers. 236, 319, 612, Trin. 1134. In Epid. 701 I should read *enim istaec captiost*, as I see no good reason for discarding the manuscript reading for Brix's conjecture, *em istaec captiost*, adopted by Götz. In Men. 846 I read *enim haereo*<sup>2</sup> with Brix. This, suggested by Ussing in his note to Aul. 492, is much to be preferred to *enim periculum est*, which he adopts in his later edition. Schöll transfers the words from Menaechmus to Matrona, and so is compelled to change *haereo* to *censeo*. In Trin. 806 *enim* is to be preferred to the manuscript *at enim*.

The two most probable conjectures that would give *enim* first place in the sentence are Lachmann's *enim verbis probus* for *in verbis probus* in Amph. 838, and Ribbeck's ingenious emendation of Mil. 1319, which will be discussed more fully below.

*Enim vero* stands at the beginning of the sentence in the following passages : Amph. 723, 771, Asin. 688, Capt. 628, Cas. 475, 728, Cist. 519, Curc. 175, 608, Men. 860, 1075, Merc. 739, Pers. 349, Poen. 296, 435 (where its parenthetical position really gives it first place), Rud. 1003, Stich. 398, 616, Trin. 958, 989 ; probably in Capt. 22 and Poen. 280.<sup>3</sup>

*Enim* is first<sup>4</sup> in four passages in Terence : Ad. 168, H. T. 72, Hec. 238, Phorm. 983, and *enim vero* in eight : And. 91, 206, H. T. 320, 1045, Hec. 673, Phorm. 465, 937, 1036.

*Enim* is found in the second place (when not joined with other particles) 21 times in Plautus and 7 in Terence. In only one

<sup>1</sup> The citations for Plautus (both plays and fragments) are made according to the edition of Götz, Löwe and Schöll ; for Terence, that of Dziatzko.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Capt. 532, Merc. 739.

<sup>3</sup> Langen's statement (p. 263) : "Weit häufiger (am Anfang des Satzes) ist aber die Verstärkung durch *vero*, mindestens dreissigmal," is incorrect.

<sup>4</sup> This position of *enim* in the earlier language is not noted by the majority of grammars in general use. Roby, II, p. 22 ; Harkness, §569, III ; Allen and Greenough, §§156, R, 345, b, and Bennett, §345, are all guilty of the same omission. Gildersleeve-Lodge, §498, n. 1, recognizes the usage. A number of equally dogmatic and incorrect additional statements could easily be secured.

passage does it occupy third place, Cas. 525 *em, nunc enim* etc., where its position can be accounted for by its close connection with *nunc*.

(ii) *The position of enim with reference to certain words.*—An examination of the passages shows that *enim*, both alone and in compounds, is often found associated with certain words. The following collocations are worthy of note:

(1) *Enim with pronouns.*—*a.* With personal pronouns: *enim*<sup>1</sup> *ego*, Cas. 280, Merc. 251, Mil. 809, Most. 888, 926, Poen. 604; *mihi*, Aul. 500, Amph. 733, Cas. 366; *me*, Trin. 1134; *tu*, Capt. 568; *enim vero ego*, Capt. 534, Pseud. 979, Trin. 958; *certo enim ego*, Aul. 811; *mihi*, Stich. 88; *at enim mihi*, Stich. 738; *nos*, Stich. 129; *tu*, Epid. 94; *quia enim me*, Merc. 248, Truc. 266; *te*, Amph. 606, Pers. 592; *certe enim tu*, Asin. 614; *nempe enim tu*, Trin. 60; *verum enim tu*, Mil. 293; *non enim tu*, Rud. 989.

*b.* With demonstrative pronouns: *enim id*, Men. 163, Ad. 730; *enimvero id*, And. 848; *verum enim vero id*, Ad. 255; *at enim id*, Bacch. 793, 1080; *quia enim id*, Most. 1098; *enim illa*, Phorm. 113; *illoc*, Men. 249; *etenim ille*, Amph. 266; *enim vero ille*, Amph. 771; *illud*, Men. 860; *at enim ille*, Cist. 739, Men. 790; *illi*, Pers. 569; *quia enim ille*, Curc. 667; *ne enim illi*, Most. 1095; *non enim illum*, Rud. 922; *neque enim illi*, Trin. 585; *enim ipsi*, Cas. 323; *etenim ipsus*, And. 442; *enim istaec*, Epid. 701, Most. 1144; *at enim istaec*, Eun. 381; *istoc*, H. T. 699; *enim hic*, Bacch. 457; *at enim hoc*, Poen. 1197; *non enim haec*, Most. 827.

*c.* With relative or interrogative pronouns: *certo enim quod*, Poen. 1182; *at enim quod*, Pers. 832; *quia enim qui*, Hec. 311; *verum enim vero qui*, Poen. 874; *quid enim*, Amph. 694.

(2) *Enim with adverbs.*—It is also joined with many adverbs, especially those of time. Thus, *nunc enim*, Asin. 598, Cas. 525, Epid. 162, 648 (*non enim nunc*), Capt. 534 (*nunc enim vero*), And. 823 (*immo enim nunc*); *enim iam*, Cas. 890; *verum enim quando*, Ad. 201.

Four examples are found of the combination *ita enim vero*, Amph. 410, Asin. 339, Cist. 519 (*enim vero ita*), Most. 920.

(3) *Enim with negative and final particles.*—It is joined with negative and final particles: *enim non*, Cist. 777, Pers. 236, Ad.

<sup>1</sup> These lists are arranged for the sake of brevity with *enim* first, even if it be postpositive.

168, Capt. 628 (*enim vero non*), Merc. 395, Mil. 1139, Pseud. 325 (*quia enim non*); *haud enim*, Capt. 592; *enim ne*, Mil. 429, Cist. 235, Most. 922 (at *enim ne*).

(4) *Enim with the first person of verbs*.—In numerous cases it is joined with the first person of verbs. Examples are: *aio enim vero*, Amph. 344, Pers. 185; *ego enim dicam*, Cas. 372.

## II.—The Force of Simple *Enim*.

(i) *Enim with corroborative force*.—In both Plautus and Terence *enim* has in the majority of cases an affirmative or corroborative force, corresponding to our 'indeed, certainly, to be sure,' and the German 'fürwahr, wahrhaftig.'

1. With this corroborative force *enim* occupies the first place in the sentence in Aul. 500, Capt. 592, Cas. 890, Cist. 777, Epid. 701, Men. 846, Mil. 1018, Most. 1144, Pers. 236, 319, 612, Trin. 806, 1134, H. T. 72, Hec. 238, Phorm. 983. I do not find any passage, resting on manuscript authority, where *enim* in the first place has any other force. Lachmann's conjecture, Amph. 838 *enim* (MSS *In*, Uss. *Id tu*) *verbis probas*, has the same meaning, with a tinge of irony.

2. It is similarly employed in the second place in the sentence with no unusual emphasis: Amph. 333, Asin. 598, Bacch. 457, Cas. 525, Epid. 648, Men. 251, Merc. 251, Phorm. 113.

3. In answers it is frequently employed with the same signification: Cas. 279–80 *Ch.* Te uxor dicebat tua Me vocare. *Lys.* Ego enim vocari iussi, 323, 366,<sup>1</sup> 372, Men. 162, Mil. 429 (*enim* first), 810, Most. 888, Pers. 670, Poen. 387, Ad. 168 (*enim* first), 730.

*Nil* is sometimes joined with *enim* in the reply: Bacch. 701–2 *Pist.* Nunc quid nos vis facere? *Chrys.* Nil enim (*Nihil* Uss., *enim nihil* R., Lang.) nisi ut ametis impero; Most. 551, Ad. 656, 921, Hec. 850.

An isolated example that may be quoted here is H. T. 317 *Cl.* Quid illa facias? *Sy.* At enim. *Cl.* Quid enim?

4. The corroborative force sometimes takes an ironical turn like *vero* or the German *freilich*: Capt. 568 Tu enim repertu's, Philocratem qui superes veriverbio; Amph. 836–8 *Alc.* Quae non

<sup>1</sup> Schöll's arrangement and punctuation of the line removed the objections to the rare and doubtful use of *enim* in questions. One other case will be considered below.

deliquit, decet Audacem esse, confidenter pro se et proterve loqui. *Amph.* Satis audacter. *Alc.* Ut pudicam decet. *Amph.* Enim verbis probas.

5. In *Amph.* 694 is found the only example of a usage so familiar in Ciceronian Latin, *quid enim* in *Quid enim censes?* te ut deludam contra lusorem meum? Langen (p. 267) denies its genuineness, and declares: "Plautus hat gewiss *quidnam censes* geschrieben." While there is no other example in the writers of the period based on as good MS authority (*Quid enim*, Curc. 273, being a conjecture; *quis enim*, Enn. 114 (M.), depending on the reading of the scholiast, and *quis enim*, ex inc. inc. fab. 1 (R. I), having so uncertain a date), there seems no reason for making the change. There are other readings of equal authority and rarity in Plautus.

(ii) *Enim with causal force*.—Most. 925-6 reads: *Tr.* Quid? tibi unquam quicquam, postquam tuos sum, verborum dedi? *Th.* Ego enim recte cavi. Lorenz, in his note to the passage, recognizing its causal force, and the implied ellipsis, translates: "*Ego enim*, 'nein, denn ich'—eine bei *nam* und *enim* wie bei γὰρ häufige und bekannte Ellipse."

In Poen. 604, Milphio exclaims: En, edepol mortales malos! whereat Agorastocles proudly replies: Ego enim docui. The passage is similar to the preceding, and the simplest and most natural way to interpret it is by supplying the evident ellipsis: 'Certainly they are, for I taught them.' To explain *enim* as equivalent to *profecto* is to decidedly weaken the force of the reply.

I have always been sorely tempted to regard a similar ellipsis as existing in Cas. 279-80 *Lys.* Te uxor aiebat tua Me vocare. *Ch.* Ego enim vocari iussi, though the causal force does not seem as strong as in the two preceding passages.

Pseud. 133 seqq. Ballio comes out heaping abuse on the heads of his slaves: Exite, agite exite, ignavi, male habiti et male conciliati Quorum numquam quicquam quoquam venit in mentem ut recte faciant Quibus nisi ad hoc exemplum experior, non potest usura usurpari, Neque homines magis asinos unquam vidi, ita plagis costae callent, Quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas, eo enim ingenio hi sunt etc. Lorenz, properly regarding *enim* as causal, explains the passage: "*noceas*, theils weil sie dann an Diebstahl, Raub und Flucht denken; denn *eo ingenio sunt* etc."

There is no necessity of thus straining the meaning of *noceas*. Ussing gives, to my mind, the true explanation by regarding the clause beginning *neque homines* as parenthetical and referring *enim* to the lines preceding.

Terence furnishes one example, And. 808-9 *nam pol si id scissem, numquam huc tetulissem pedem; semper enim dictast esse atque habitast soror*.

Of the half dozen or more examples of *enim* that have found their way into the text of Plautus by conjecture, I shall mention only one, Ribbeck's emendation of Mil. 1319 *Enim pietas sic hortat*. Two objections have been urged against the conjecture, the use of *enim* as causal and the active form *hortat*. The first has been already disposed of. The second is stronger, though examples of the active forms of *hortor* are cited by Ribbeck in his critical notes and the lexicons. It must be admitted from Langen's statistics (p. 63) as to the forms of *hortor* in Plautus based on manuscript authority that the active form is improbable, though possible. Still the strongest argument against the reading is the position of *enim*. It has been shown that in all passages, in both Plautus and Terence, where *enim* holds the first place, its force is corroborative. Indeed, we are justified in regarding this as a rule. *Enim* in Ribbeck's text is nothing if not causal, and in its position lies the gravest objection to its adoption.

It is in place to state Langen's argument as to the non-existence of causal *enim* in Plautus. Briefly put, it is as follows: In a large majority of passages in Plautus *enim* has the corroborative force and no other meaning is possible. In the remaining examples a causal force is possible, though a corroborative force can be given. Therefore there is no passage in which the corroborative force is impossible. Let us test this argument with reference to Terence. It is agreed that the investigation must start with simple *enim* and proceed to its compounds. In Terence there are 10 instances of simple *enim* with corroborative force to one with causal. Applying Langen's reasoning, as the overwhelming majority of passages are corroborative, all may well be, and the one causal instance vanishes. But it does not. Langen admits that it is causal and cannot be otherwise. If one example in 11 can be causal in Terence, is the proportion so great as to make it impossible for 3 out of 37 or 4 out of 38 in Plautus, as shown above? It may be answered that the causal meaning is the only permissible one in the Terentian passage, but only one of two and

perhaps not the better in the four Plautine examples. It is no greater feat of mental gymnastics to read a corroborative force into the passage from the *Andria* than into the passages cited from Plautus. The causal force of *enim* in a number of passages in Plautus yet to be discussed is as plain to me as the majority admittedly so in Terence. Each reading only emphasizes this view. Tests made with others, who could not be accused of bias toward either view, favor the causal interpretation as the only reasonable one, and as the clearest and most emphatic. I can see no special difference in usage between Plautus and Terence in this regard. Any preconceived idea, carried out to its logical result, will be as sweeping in its conclusions as Langen's on this subject. That the conclusions are always correct, and the process a laudable one, is deserving of serious question.

### III.—*Enim with Affirmative Particles.*

(i) *Enim vero*.—From *enim* we pass to the strengthened form *enim vero*, which simply increases the force of the affirmation. The view of some early grammarians, that it may have an adversative force like *sed*, is not sustained by the examples. Dräger<sup>1</sup> shows that its occurrence with this meaning is only in later prose.

1. It is found in simple assertions: *Amph.* 266, 723, 771, *Capt.* 22, *Cas.* 475, *Cist.* 519, *Men.* 860, *Stich.* 398, *Trin.* 958, *And.* 91, 206.

2. It is often used to denote a state or condition, and then is frequently accompanied by a temporal particle: *Capt.* 534 *Nunc enim vero occidi*; *Curc.* 175, 608, *Merc.* 739, *Hec.* 673.

3. It is used in statements expressing indignation or irony: *H. T.* 1045, *Phor.* 465.

4. It is found in answers. These are of two kinds: (1) where the answer is suggested by the statements of the preceding speaker: *Capt.* 628 *Heg.* *Fuistin liber?* *Tyn.* *Fui.* *Ar.* *Enim vero non fuit, nugas agit*; *Most.* 920, *Pers.* 349, *Poen.* 280, 296, 435, *Rud.* 1003, *Stich.* 616, *Trin.* 989, *And.* 848, *H. T.* 320, *Phorm.* 937, 985; (2) where the answer is a direct reply to the preceding question: *Amph.* 344 *Merc.* *Ain vero?* *So.* *Aio enim vero*; 410, 759, *Asin.* 339, 688, *Cas.* 728, *Men.* 1075, *Pers.* 185, *Pseud.* 979, *Trin.* 987, *Phorm.* 1036.

<sup>1</sup> *Historische Syntax*, II, p. 131.



(ii) *Certe enim* and *certo enim*.—Langen<sup>1</sup> in an exhaustive study and citation of the Plautine and Terentian passages in which the words occur, reaches the conclusion that in Plautus *certe* expresses 'subjective certainty' and *certo* 'objective certainty.' In Terence we find *certe* in its later classical usage taking the place of *certo* in expressions of 'objective certainty.' The same results apply in the use of the words when strengthened by *enim*. The examples are not numerous—six in Plautus and one in Terence.

1. *Certe enim* is found Amph. 331, 658, Asin. 614, And. 503. Aul. 811 the manuscripts read: *Certo enim ego vocem hic loquentis modo mi audire visus sum*. This should be changed to Langen's reading *certe*, in conformity to his rule.

2. *Certo enim* occurs in two passages: Poen. 1182 *Certo enim, quod ad nos attinuit, Pulchrae praepollentesque, soror, fuimus*; Stich. 88 *Certo enim mihi paternae vocis sonitus auris accidit*. Terence has no example of the combination.

(iii) *Nempe enim*.—Trin. 61 Ritschl and Schöll read: *Nempe enim tu, credo, me imprudentem obrepseris*. The manuscript reading *namque enim* is adopted and defended by Brix, Hand,<sup>2</sup> Langen<sup>3</sup> and others. It must be admitted that Ritschl's conjecture is unusual, it being the first instance of the usage outside of the writers of the Silver Age. On the other hand, *namque enim* occurs nowhere else. Hand would explain it as a colloquialism, comparing it with *neque haud*. This explanation is far from acceptable. Ritschl's conjecture<sup>4</sup> has two reasons to commend it: (1) it is probable from the frequent interchange of *nempe*, *namque*, *neque* in the manuscripts, and (2) more important still, it is in perfect harmony with Megaronides' remark.<sup>5</sup>

#### IV.—*Enim* with Adversative Particles.

(i) *At enim*.—*Enim* is frequently joined with the adversative particle *at*, having in most cases the affirmative or corroborative force already noticed. It may then be translated 'but indeed, but surely.'

1. Examples of such usage are: Bacch. 993, 1080 (*et* MSS, *sed* Acidalius), Cist. 235, 739, Epid. 94, Men. 790, Merc. 159, Most.

<sup>1</sup> Beiträge, pp. 22–31.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. IV, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Beiträge, p. 261.

<sup>4</sup> Prolegomena, p. lxxv (reprinted in his Opuscula, vol. V, p. 332).

<sup>5</sup> For other conjectures and discussions of this much-disputed passage, see Schöll, App. Crit., p. 127.

808, Pers. 569, 832, Poen. 914, 1197 (twice), Pseud. 436, Stich. 129, 738, Trin. 919, Eun. 381, 751, H. T. 317, 699, 713.

2. In Most. 922 At enim ne captioni mihi sit, si dederim tibi is an example of the common ellipsis of *metuo*.<sup>1</sup> In Ad. 830 seq. we have At enim metuas, ne ab re sint tamen Omissiores paulo.

3. It is used in the reply expressing indignation or some other emotion: Phorm. 487 *Ph.* Audi quod dicam. *Do.* At enim taedet iam audire eadem milia.

4. It is found twice in questions in connection with *scin*: Pseud. 538, 641.

5. One example is found of a comical play on the particle: Epid. 95 At enim,—bat enim. With this can be compared Pseud. 236 *Cal.* At. *Ps.* Bat; and Pers. 213 *Paeg.* Heia. *Soph.* Beia.

(ii) *Verum enim*.—Langen<sup>2</sup> shows that *verum* has only adverbative force. Any interpretation (like that of Ussing in his note to Asin. 790, who translates it by *sane*) which would regard it as synonymous with *vero* is incorrect.

1. Six examples of *verum enim* are found in Plautus and Terence: Cist. 80, Mil. 293, Poen. 874, Ad. 201, Eun. 742, Phorm. 555. In five of these *verum* has plainly the force of *sed*. The sixth presents unusual difficulties. It is Poen. 873-4, where Goetz reads: *Syn.* I in malam rem. *Mil.* I tu atque herus. *Syn.* Verum enim qui homo eum norit, cito homo pervorti. Geppert changed the second verse so as to read: Verum enim, si modo eum noris etc., where *verum enim* can only have the force of *enim vero*, and the answer is not in harmony with what precedes.

Two ways out of the difficulty suggest themselves. *Enim vero* can be read, in harmony with the numerous passages where its Plautine force has been shown, or we can suppose that some passage or lines containing Synecratus' reply has been lost, and that the statement of the text is its continuation.

2. A strengthened form of *verum enim* is *verum enim vero*. An example of this is found in each author: Capt. 599, Ad. 255.

(iii) *Sed enim*.<sup>3</sup>—No example of *sed enim* is found in the manuscripts of Plautus or Terence. Three conjectures have introduced

<sup>1</sup> Lorenz in his note on the passage cites other examples of the same ellipsis.

<sup>2</sup> Beiträge, pp. 113-21.

<sup>3</sup> See Brix's note on Mil. 983.

it into the text. So Acidalius in Bacch. 1080 in place of *etenim* (at enim Pareus), Ritschl in Bacch. 1083, while Goetz prefers to follow the manuscripts, and again in Mil. 983, with Fleckeisen and Lorenz. Ribbeck, Brix and Goetz, however, read *sed ne et istam* instead of *sed enim ne istam*, which removed the faulty hiatus *sed ne istam*. The first example based on manuscript authority is in Cato, Or. pro Rhod. (Jordan, 23, 9).

(iv) *Immo enim*.—*Immo enim* is used whenever an opinion opposed to what has just been expressed is to be emphatically stated: Pseud. 31 *Call.* Lege vel tabellas redde. *Ps.* Immo enim pellegam; Stich. 699, And. 823, Phorm. 337. *Enim* has in these examples its corroborative force.

The stronger form *immo enim vero* occurs with substantially the same force: Capt. 608, Eun. 329, Phorm. 528.

#### V.—*Enim with Causal and Final Particles.*

(i) *Quia enim*.—*Enim* is often joined with *quia*, strengthening or intensifying its causal force. It is thus found in answers to questions introduced by

1. *Qui*, Amph. 266, 1034, Pers. 228, Truc. 733.
2. *Qui istuc*, Phorm. 331.
3. *Qui dum*, Epid. 299, Rud. 1116.
4. *Qui vero*, Merc. 395 (Ritschl).
5. *Quid*, Capt. 884, Cas. 385, Curc. 449, Mil. 1139, Poen. 1344, Truc. 266 *Quia enim me truculentum nominas*.
6. *Quid ita*, Pers. 592.
7. *Quid iam*, Bacch. 50, Mil. 834, Pseud. 325.<sup>1</sup>
8. *Quo argumento*, Mil. 1001.
9. *Qua istuc ratione*, Pseud. 804.
10. *Quamobrem*, Curc. 443, 667, H. T. 800.
11. *Cur*, Merc. 648, Most. 1097.
12. *Qua propter*, H. T. 188, Hec. 311.

(ii) *Ut enim, ne enim*.—In a similar way *enim* with its affirmative force is joined with the final particles *ut* and *ne*. Thus with

1. *Ut*, Cas. 268, Epid. 277, Poen. 855.
2. *Ne*, Most. 1095.

<sup>1</sup> Lorenz, by comparing this passage with 318 (*quia pol*) and 345 (*quia edepol*), shows the connection between *enim, pol* and *edepol*.

VI.—*Enim with Negative Particles.*

(i) *Non enim*.—There are two distinct usages of *non enim*, as has been found to be the case with simple *enim*.

1. It has already been shown that in a large majority of the passages in Plautus and Terence in which it occurs, the force of *enim* is merely corroborative. A comparison of the passages containing *non enim* in the light of these results will give the same conclusions. Accustomed as most scholars of Plautus have been to Ciceronian usage, they have often been led astray by the discovery that *enim* with causal force, in negative sense, is not in place in several passages. To remove this difficulty the archaic negative *noenum* or *noenu* is substituted, as by Ritschl in Trin. 705 and Bücheler in Asin. 808. It is questionable if this is either necessary or based on good reasons. The examples of *noenum* (*u*) based on manuscript authority are so rare that conjectures increasing their number must be regarded as venturesome.<sup>1</sup> With the corroborative force of *enim*, so generally admitted, no change is necessary.

This corroborative force is shown by the following examples: Aul. 594, Cist. 562, Epid. 162, Most. 1133, Pseud. 1266, Rud. 989, Stich. 600, Truc. 309.

Three passages similar in construction are: Mil. 283 *Non enim faciam quin scias*; Stich. 302 *Non enim possum quin revortar*; Trin. 705 *Non enim possum quin exclamem*.

*Non enim* is used once in Terence to express a strong, confident denial: Phorm. 694 *An. Quid fiet? Ge. Non enim ducet*.

2. In the following passages the causal force of *enim* is far more in place than the corroborative; indeed, in several it is the only possible one.

Capt. 860 *Heg. Non sentio. Ergas. Non enim es in senticeto, eo non sentis*. Brix, striving to reproduce the pun and at the same time preserve the corroborative force of *enim*, translates: "Ja, du bist auch kein Märker." A correct translation must bring out the causal force of *enim*: 'You don't feel, because you are not in the briars.'

Most. 827-8, Tranio says of the door-posts: *Atque etiam nunc satis boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice. Non enim haec pultifagus*

<sup>1</sup> The only cases I have discovered are Aul. 67 and Lucr. 3, 199; 4, 712. The three passages in Ennius, A. 287, 479 (M) and F. 201 (R) are all due to conjecture. See L. Müller, Lucilius, 30, 23 (p. 267); Ritschl, Opus, vol. II, p. 242.

opufex opera fecit barbarus. Sonnenschein, in his note on the passage, says: "This is one of the few passages in Plaut., in which *enim* seems to approach very nearly to the meaning of 'for,' but it may be translated 'look you.' " I cannot see how any translation but the causal can be defended here. Tranio plainly assigns his reason for the good condition of the posts. He does not stop and turn to Theopropides with the exclamation 'Look you, no pottage-eating artisan from foreign parts made them.'

So Poen. 285-6 *Nam pro erilei et nostro quaestu satis bene ornatae sumus. Non enim pote quaestus fieri, nisi sumptus sequitur scio*, and Truc. 907-8 *Numquam uno hoc die eficiatur opus quin opus semper siet. Non enim possunt militares pueri ut alii* (Bugge, *avis*, Schöll) *educier*.

Rud. 921-2 Gripus in his monologue says: *Vigilare decet hominem qui volt sua temperi conficere officia*, adding as his reason, not as a parallel statement, *non enim illum exspectare oportet dum erus se ad suom suscitet*.

Bücheler read *noenum* Asin. 808, where the text has *Haec sunt non nugae: non enim mortualia*. Ussing would explain it thus: "*Haec seria sunt, non nugae; neque enim mortuis haec cantantur, sed vivis.*" This explanation is designed to meet Langen's objection as to its causal force, since anything can be *nugae*, without being necessarily *mortualia*. Ussing's interpretation has much to commend it, though I doubt the genuineness of the verse.

Eun. 453 *Th. Bene dixti ac mi istuc non in mentem venerat. Gn. Ridiculum! non enim cogitaras*. We may translate: 'Absurd! why, you had not thought of it.' It is not difficult to see something of the causal force in the passage.

(ii) *Neque enim*.—The same peculiarities of usage are exhibited in *neque enim*.

1. Its corroborative force, in a negative sense, is shown in Cas. 888 *Reppulit mihi manum; neque enim dare sibi saviu me sinit*.

2. Its causal force is evident in Pers. 63 seq. *Neque quadruplari me volo; neque enim decet Sine meo periculo ire aliena ereptum bona, Neque illi qui faciunt, mihi placent; Trin. 584 Les. Nam certumst sine dote haud dare. Stas. Quin tu i modo. Les. Neque enim illi damno umquam esse patiar*.

This force is still more marked in two passages from Terence: Ad. 647 *Habitant hic quaedam mulieres pauperculae; Ut opinor*

eas non nosse se et certo scio; Neque enim diu huc migrarunt; Hec. 833-5 Haec tot propter me gaudia illi contigisse laetor: Etsi hoc meretrices aliae nolunt; neque enim est in rem nostram Ut quisquam amator in nuptiis laetetur.<sup>1</sup>

(iii) *Numquam enim*.—*Numquam* occurs with *enim* in corroborative force in Pers. 489, Stich. 96, 751.

## VII.—*Etenim*.

*Etenim* (a word as peculiar and mysterious in its formation as *namque*) is foreign to Plautus, the only passage in which it is retained in the text being in the late prologue to the *Amphitruo*, where (v. 26) we read: *Etenim ille, quois huc iussu venio, Juppiter, Non minus quam nostrum quivis formidat malum*. The two passages Cist. 777 and Bacch. 1080, in which the manuscript reading has been changed in our texts, have already been discussed. The causal force, shown in the *Amphitruo* passage, occurs in three passages from Terence: And. 442 *Deinde desinet. Etenim ipse secum eam rem reputavit via*; Eun. 1074 *Ut lubenter vivis (etenim bene lubenter victitas)*; H. T. 546-7 *Facile equidem facere possum si iubes. Etenim quo pacto id fieri soleat calleo*. I see no reason to read with Langen, in the *Eunuchus* passage, *et enim* ("und wahrlich"). The causal force is not as strong, it is true, as in the other two examples.<sup>2</sup>

Omitting all conjectures that would introduce causal *enim* into the text and all examples of *etenim*, there are, at a rough estimate, 14 examples of *enim* corroborative to 1 of *enim* causal in Plautus, while in Terence the proportion is 13 to 1. The causal force in the examples from Plautus is clear, in most cases as much so as those of Terence. The percentage of causal examples, though not large, is respectable enough not to be rejected through mere devotion to a theory. The proportion, too, it will be noted, is nearly as large as in Terence. With the exception of *etenim*, which leads a peculiar existence in most of the poets before the Silver Age, the use of *enim* and its compounds in the two poets

<sup>1</sup> Dräger's statement (Syntax, vol. II, p. 68): "*Nec enim* statt *non enim* findet sich zuerst Ter. Hec. V 3, 36," is shown by the above examples from Plautus to be incorrect.

<sup>2</sup> Dräger's statement (Syntax, vol. II, p. 171) that *etenim* occurs twice in Plautus and four times in Terence must be corrected.

seems to harmonize. Under such conditions, it is impossible to give any dogmatic assertion regarding the origin and growth of the causal usage. Had more of the earlier language, outside of the two dramatists, been preserved, such a statement might be risked. With the scant remains at our disposal, and these largely conjectural, no satisfactory results can be gained. It is for this reason that other writers of the period, though examined, have not been drawn into the discussion.<sup>1</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO,  
Aug. 6, 1897.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT.

<sup>1</sup> Remoteness from large libraries and philological centres makes it impossible for me to familiarize myself with more than the names of many of the German dissertations or programs bearing more or less directly on the theme. Experiences while a student abroad convinced me that it is often impossible to secure certain much-quoted pamphlets or articles. Omissions or failures to make proper reference or give due credit are not always the result of carelessness or ignorance.